UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,504	03/26/2004	Takaaki Suzuki	2004_0475	8597
	7590 12/27/200 , LIND & PONACK, 1	EXAMINER		
2033 K STREET N. W. SUITE 800			TAYLOR, JOSHUA D	
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			4157	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments	10/809,504	SUZUKI, TAKAAKI			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	JOSHUA TAYLOR	4157			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the co	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
	-· action is non-final.				
<i>;</i> —	, 				
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
	pante Quayre, 1000 0.2. 1.1, 10	0 0.0.2.0.			
Disposition of Claims					
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 10/270,504. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)					

Application/Control Number: 10/809,504 Page 2

Art Unit: 2626

DETAILED ACTION

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-6 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 9, and 10 of U.S. Patent No. 6745393. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for the following reasons.

Claim 1 adds, "wherein, for the at least one tuning request stored in the tuning request storage section, the result of the corresponding tuning process is notified to the application which issued the at least one tuning request." However, this is obvious since it is disclosed that under the DVB-MHP standard, for any tuning request issued from an application, the result of a corresponding tuning process be notified back to the application.

Claim 2 states "The broadcast receiving apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the tuning request storage section stores information indicating which application has issued the at least one tuning request." This is obvious, since if the application is to be notified, the tuning request storage section must know which application issued the request.

Claim 3 is the same as claim 2 from US 6,745,393.

Claim 4 is similar to claim 9 from US 6,745,393 in the same way that claim 1 is similar to claim 1 from US 6,745,393.

Claim 5 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 2.

Claim 6 is rejected as being an obvious variant of claim 10 from US 6,745,393.

Application/Control Number: 10/809,504 Page 4

Art Unit: 2626

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to JOSHUA TAYLOR whose telephone number is 571-270-3755.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-5pm, M-F, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Vu Le can be reached on (571) 272-7332. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Josh Taylor/

Examiner, Art Unit 4157

/ABUL K. AZAD/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626